UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Post-War Trade: The Blind Alley of Civilization - - - - *Stanton A. Coblentz*

The New Physics and Religion - - - - - - - - - - *Alfred Stiernotte*

Abolishing Hate - - - - - - - - - - - - *George Lawrence Parker*

The Child's Morality - - - - - - - - - - - - - - *Ethel S. Beer*

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS

VOLUME CXXXI NUMBER 11

Chicago, January, 1946

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Monthly Until Further Notice

Subscription $1.50
Single Copies 15 cents

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, April 11, 1941, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

CURTIS W. REESE, *Editor*

Contributors

Ethel S. Beer: Author of *Day Nursery.*

John Nicholls Booth: Minister of The Church of All Souls, Evanston, Illinois.

Stanton A. Coblentz: Well-known journalist and author.

C. A. Hawley: Minister of the First Presbyterian Church, Atchison, *Kansas.*

John Haynes Holmes: Minister of The Community Church of New York, New York City.

George Lawrence Parker: Minister of the First Congregational Parish, Duxbury, Massachusetts.

Alfred Stiernotte: Minister of the First Unitarian Church, Vancouver, B. C.

Eleanor Darnall Wallace: President of the Evanston Y. W. C. A., and member of the Board of Book Reviewers for the *Christian Advocate.*

James M. Yard: Executive Director of the Chicago Round Table of Christians and Jews.

Contents

EDITORIAL—
CURTIS W. REESE 147

ARTICLES—
Comments—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 148
Post-War Trade: The Blind Alley of Civilization—
STANTON A. COBLENTZ 151
The New Physics and Religion—ALFRED STIERNOTTE 152
Abolishing Hate—GEORGE LAWRENCE PARKER 154
The Child's Morality—ETHEL S. BEER 155

POETRY—
Closed Eyes—LEE SPENCER 150
Little Houses of the Mind—SHELDON SHEPARD 159

THE STUDY TABLE—
Dark Night—ELEANOR DARNALL WALLACE 157
The Christian Year—JOHN NICHOLLS BOOTH 158
Rainer Maria Rilke—C. A. HAWLEY 158
Accepting Life—JAMES M. YARD 159
A Sacred Anthology—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 159

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS 160

THE FIELD—
National Citizens Committee Findings Favor U. A. W.—
Bulletin of International Religion and Labor Foundation .. 146

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

National Citizens Committee Findings Favor UAW

According to the December 7th **PM** a 14-member national citizens committee, invited to Detroit by the United Auto Workers, has issued a report that supports the union in its fight with General Motors.

Chaired by Dr. Henry Hitt Crane, pastor, Central Methodist Church in Detroit, this group of nationally-known leaders listened for two days to documentary evidence as presented by the UAW and made a dispassionate appraisal of the reasons for the strike conflict. Among the points made are the following four:

1. If President Truman and his advisors had had access to this record [of pre-strike negotiations], we believe they would have been in a position to insist more firmly on the full use of the collective bargaining process before suggesting intervention by the government.

2. The corporation's ability to meet a wage increase is a sound factor in the determination of wages, both in good times and bad.

3. The union has shown a sense of social responsibility that indicates its growing maturity and is certainly to be commended.

4. Outside of a flat denial supported by figures based upon sources not open to the union, to this committee, or to the public, no convincing evidence has been submitted by the corporation to show that the union's wage proposal cannot be met.

Included on the committee are: Leon Henderson, Research Institute of America; Bishop William Scarlett, St. Louis; Mrs. M. E. Tilly, Southwestern Conference, Methodist Church; Robert Garrison, New Council of American Business; Frank McCulloch, James Mullenbach Industrial Institute, Chicago; Ernest W. Burgess, University of Chicago; Walter White, National Association for the Advancement of the Colored People; Mrs. J. Birdsall Calkins, president, Young Women's Christian Association; Rabbi Leon Fram, Detroit; Mrs. Bonaro W. Overstreet, New York author and lecturer; Dr. Henry H. Overstreet, New York University; Rev. John Hanna, Congregational Christian Churches.

The Religion and Labor Foundation strongly urges its members and affiliates to recommend a similar committee strategy in connection with all industrial disputes in their communities.

—*Bulletin of International Religion and Labor Foundation.*

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXXI JANUARY, 1946 No. 11

Editorial

With this issue UNITY enters upon a period of unified editorial and managerial responsibility. The previous arrangement, whereby Dr. John Haynes Holmes and I shared editorial responsibility, worked better than anyone could have expected but it was at best unsatisfactory to both of us. It is my hope, however, that the writings of Dr. Holmes will appear frequently in UNITY, as his Comments do in this issue.

UNITY was originally established in 1878 as the unofficial organ of the Western Unitarian Conference, and throughout the years its columns have always been open to liberal religious thinkers and leaders of all faiths. This dual purpose will continue to be served. UNITY now goes to the ministers, the officers, and the religious education directors of all the churches in the Western Unitarian Conference. It also goes to liberal religious leaders in various parts of the country. Interpreting religion broadly, UNITY has always aimed to be a spearpoint of liberal, progressive, and humanistic thought in all fields. These purposes, growing out of UNITY's history and sustained by its publishers, will be adhered to by the editor.

The Unitarian, the Universalist, the Liberal Jewish, the Friends, the Ethical Culture and the Humanist movements all have their own publications. The Modernist Christians are ably served by *The Christian Century. The Nation, The New Republic,* and a host of other journals are devoted to public affairs on the action level. It would be useless for UNITY to attempt to duplicate the functions served by these specialized journals. But in all of these movements and causes there are numerous persons who, at least in their thinking, want to move out beyond the limits of denominational and mass movements; who want to rethink the presuppositions of their faith; and who want and need contact with others of like kind. To all such, UNITY offers a means of communication.

It is not necessary, therefore, for manuscripts offered for publication to fit into the pattern of any established group. It is necessary, however, that articles show competency in the fields under discussion and that they be directed toward the enrichment and advancement of liberal religion and progressive democracy. Reckless and irresponsible utterances that stir up racial animosity or that slyly undermine confidence in democratic processes and goals have no rightful place in the columns of a liberal journal. The principle of free discussion may not properly be used as an excuse for or to justify playing the game of those who are committed to prejudice, bigotry, and intolerance. It is the aim of the editor to see to it that UNITY serves purposes that are broadly humanitarian, intelligently critical, and fundamentally democratic. Articles that serve such purposes are invited and will be used within the limits of available space.

Curtis W. Reese

Comments

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

I

Curious, how men are proposing these days to settle the world's problems by tearing people apart instead of bringing them together! I had always thought that peace was to be established by putting into practice the principle of unity, as here in the United States, for example, where we have united into one single population men and women of all races, religions, and nationalities. But now, apparently, it is agreed that there can be no unity, and that peace can only be had by severing mankind into separate and mutually hostile groups. Thus, in India, it is being proposed to divide the country into two states, a Mohammedan and a Hindu, this on the supposition that Mohammedans and Hindus in India can never be brought to live together in freedom. In Palestine, the idea of dividing the Holy Land into a Jewish state and an Arab state is being revived. This, said the London *Times,* in a leading editorial, is the only solution of the Zionist problem. In Poland, we have one more partition of this unhappy country, with Poles driven out of one section annexed by Soviet Russia, and Germans driven out of a new section torn away from East Prussia. This, of course, on the principle that Poles, Russians, and Germans cannot be expected to live peaceably together! Thus, all over the map, there are exchanges of population, migrations of whole peoples, an attempt to sort out nationalities, and thus set up everywhere a great array of homogeneous countries, each fearing and hating all the others. Anything more melancholy than this I cannot imagine. Anything more hopeless than this I cannot conceive. If we have actually got to the point in this unhappy world where people of different blood and creed cannot be expected to live together any more, but must be kept from tearing each other to pieces by being put behind impassable barriers, then we might as well give up the idea of peace right here and now. For this policy can bring us nowhere but to a final maelstrom of blood and death. There is only one sure road to peace, and that is to learn to *live together* as citizens of one state, as members of one family. Not to separate peoples but to combine them, not to divide lands but to merge them, not to rear barriers but to tear them down—this is the statesmanship we need. Deeper into the mire of hate we plunge! More and more on sheer force and violence are we placing our reliance! The end is certain—a final war, and a final end. Only love can save us—the union of each in the service of all!

II

There are some things in this present-day world which are so incredible that one can only gasp in dumb amazement. The fighting in Java, for example! Here are a colonial people who want to be free. What is that but what the United Nations were battling for in the great war now concluded in victory? The very thing precisely promised in the Atlantic Charter? The foreign overlord in this case is Holland, since Java is a part of the Dutch Empire reconquered from the Japanese. But Holland has not the troops, or ships, or bombing planes, to reduce these rebellious subjects to submission. So Great Britain volunteers to do the job —a dirty job which the British Empire has long practiced in India! But troops are again lacking, so Britain takes her Indian soldiery; and, since these are insufficient to beat down the Javanese, adds to them some captive Japanese regiments. Yes, believe it or not, Japanese soldiers are now being used by English officers to fight and overwhelm the natives of Indonesia who are trying to throw off the alien rule of Holland. And we Americans are having our charming part in this horror, for it is our planes and our bombs, with labels carefully removed, which are working havoc with cities and villages. Whole populations are being driven into the wilderness, and others slaughtered, as this attempt at human freedom is smothered in blood. The awful thing about this episode, apart from its character as a sheer atrocity, is the joint conspiracy of action on the part of the oppressors involved. The empires—Dutch, British and American—act with one spirit and one accord. As though by an instinctive impulse, they move together to suppress this simple demand of an exploited people for liberty. The great traditions at home —in Holland, England, and the United States alike—seem to avail nothing. Not at least on this other side of the globe! And so, after a great and costly war to deliver the world from the threat of Nazism, the chains of slavery are bound anew upon the Eastern World. What hope of freedom is there for mankind today? Think of the atomic bomb and its possibilities! Even though the great powers agree, in mutual prudence, not to use the bomb against each other, they will all, most likely, agree to use it against the subjects of their empires. Russia will plant a bomb in Latvia, another in Poland, a third in Romania, and a fourth in northern Korea; Britain will put one in Bombay and another in Calcutta, and others in Greece, Kenya, and Hong Kong; our own country will have bomb stations in Porto Rico and the islands of the Pacific, and a few deposits scattered about in South America. And then what chance has anybody anywhere for liberation? Even though we escape annihilation at the hands of this monstrous instrument, we are doomed anew to imperialism and all its woes. As a sign of the times, therefore, and espe-

cially as a portent of the future, the Java episode as one of the first events of the new atomic age, is a thing to paralyze the soul.

III

The temperature is dropping rather alarmingly, both for the Truman administration in this country and for the Labor Government in England. Stalin in Russia seems to be fading into the background—strange rumors as to his health! Only General De Gaulle of France is holding his own. President Truman's honeymoon is obviously over. Not only is there now strong opposition to his policies, which is to be expected in a democracy of freely differing opinion, but also a growing question of his capacity for leadership. Able and incorruptible, he yet has a certain Harding attitude of "take it easy," "I'm a regular fellow," which is disquieting in days like these. The *Progressive* some weeks ago declared that "the President must begin to show the industry, courage and purposefulness which made him so appealing a figure as chairman of the Senate War Investigating Committee, . . . if he is to measure up to the tremendous job he has inherited." The Labor Government of England still holds the confidence of the people, but wonderment and even impatience are beginning to appear on both sides of the Atlantic. There are certain issues which represent "test cases," so to speak. Palestine, for example! Here the pledges of the Labor Party are clear and emphatic. The Party is on record as sustaining Zionism and the hopes of the Jews for a homeland in the Holy Land. Yet, after all these months, the White Paper is still not withdrawn, and the perishing Jews of Europe are given no hope of rescue. Is it possible that Prime Minister Attlee and his colleagues are going to leave this tragic problem unresolved after all these years? Then there is India! Is there to be no brave, far-visioned constructive program for the freedom of this country? Is imperial interest to dominate a Labor as well as a Tory cabinet? I cannot believe so—first, because I still believe in Labor; secondly, because I know Pethick-Lawrence, the new Secretary for India, and trust him; thirdly, because the end of the war and conditions in the Far East make delay no longer feasible or safe. But thus far the Labor Government has really done nothing more than revitalize the Cripps Plan, which is acceptable to no party or group in India. What does this mean? What Hong Kong means—the Empire in the full flower of its arrogance and domination? Or that time must be granted, patience exercised in working out this long-standing problem? What we need in Westminster these days is some token at least that a new mind, a new spirit, is at work in Britain. Thus far that token has not been given—and liberals everywhere are disappointed and anxious. But, having expressed our fears, both as regards Washington and London, let us reserve judgment. Time will tell!

IV

Why is it impossible to send food, money, or other material relief into Germany? Why were the 200,000 tons of army rations sent to Europe for the use of soldiers who have now returned to America—why were these consignments of food not released for the feeding of hungry mouths among the conquered populations? Despite the assurance of General Eisenhower to the contrary, there is abundant evidence that Germans are starving, and that mid-winter will see such famine as central Europe has not witnessed since the Thirty Years War when vast numbers of people became cannibals. The situation is so bad in Germany, it has been said, that it would take six ships of 10,000 tons burden per day to supply the people with enough food to survive the winter. In Vienna the people are now receiving 760 calories per day, and in the Tyrol 850 calories per day. This as over against 1,500 calories a day in Hitler's starvation camps, and 2,000 calories a day as the accepted minimum for health! A visitor from Mars, observing this slow extermination of men, women, and little children, would say that the conquerors of Germany had deliberately entered into a conspiracy to starve the German populace. The situation is exactly that of a besieged city, with plenty of food outside, and none inside. We Americans are frequently berated for living so well, and actually destroying or cutting down surplus food supplies. But what is the use of saving when we are denied access to those who need so desperately what we can give? Of course, there are other countries where we can help, and should do so at our own sacrifice. But meanwhile Germany is perishing, her people dropping in the streets, parents committing suicide in the last desperate hope that their orphaned children may get help now being denied. Which raises the question as to whether or not the war is over—and the deeper question as to the injunction: "If thine enemy hunger, feed him!" Here is a case for the Christian conscience, if there is any such conscience. The Catholic Church, through its bishops, spoke out some time ago in denunciation of our treatment of Germany, Austria and Hungary. Where is the voice of Protestantism, to make known its abhorrence of this horror? What confronts the world today is the appalling fact that the whole continent of Europe is dying of cold, hunger, and disease. The conquered countries are a part of this continent, and must be included in any work of rescue and relief. After all, people are people—*children are children.* "Whoso shall cause one of these little ones to stumble, it were better that a great millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he should be sunk into the depths of the sea."

V

General J. F. C. Fuller, one of England's leading military experts, has interesting things to say about the moral character of the late war we have been fighting to save the world to decency. Writing in the *Army Ordnance* magazine, General Fuller testifies as follows:

> A decreasing moral sense has steadily kept pace with the growth of armament; for as explosives have gone up, morality has gone down. Treaties are now scraps of paper; war aims are weathercocks which change with each political breeze; pledged words are sugared lies; honor between allies, veiled deceit; and obligations toward neutrals, implements of betrayal. Allies change sides, enemies become friends and friends become enemies, and the leaders of the opposing nations bawl at each other like fishwives, until war dissolves into a howling pandemonium in which every kind of atrocity is applauded when committed against the enemy and execrated when perpetrated by him.

It is to be noted that, in this statement, General Fuller is speaking of both sides of the combat—of the United Nations as well as of the Nazis. And necessarily so, as the moral collapse was quite as evident on one side as on the other. It may be argued, of course, that war is itself the negation of all morality. And so it is! But there was a time when a plighted word, even to the enemy, was sacred, as in the famous case of the Roman consul, Regulus. In the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, a commanding general refused to take advantage of his enemy, as, for example, when Marlborough notified his opponents, the French, when he was emerging from winter quarters and beginning the spring campaign. Even in our own time we can remember when open cities were protected from bombardment, and civilian populations were held immune from attack. But now all these moral scruples have gone, and, as General Fuller points out, in exact relation "with the growth of armaments in violence and terror." Bombing is the supreme instance of what is meant. In the beginning of this last war, bombing was called "precision bombing," and was pretty scrupulously confined to military objectives. Then the Nazis broke loose with their sweeping assaults from the skies on Plymouth, Coventry, London, and Rotterdam. Speedily the Allies bettered the instruction with so-called "saturation bombing" of Cologne, Hamburg, Nürnberg, Dresden, Munich, and Berlin. All the while, in exact proportion to their ruthless use, the bombs grew larger and more terrible. At last, as the crowning horror of all, came the atomic bomb. How rapturously this final atrocity was applauded! Though, had the Germans or Japanese used it first, the welkin would have rung with denunciation, as indeed it did in the case of the comparatively innocent rocket-bombs. It is always the enemy who is atrocious! But the point is that both sides, under the influence of devastating power, went swiftly moving toward utter savagery. Our moral sensibilities are dead. We do not even have any moral philosophies any longer. This is worse than bestiality, for the beasts do not pretend to have any such thing as morality. Even so, they are pretty decent as compared with men.

VI

It is inspiring to read that Kagawa is coming into his own. After the fire, and the earthquake, and the mighty wind, there comes again "the still, small voice" of the spirit. An Associated Press dispatch from Tokyo quotes the Japanese Prime Minister as saying that Kagawa is one of the men upon whom he would rely for the regeneration of his people. He thinks, and rightly, that Kagawa can be most helpful in re-establishing friendship between Japan and the United States. This same dispatch also states that General Douglas MacArthur's advisors are counting heavily on this great Japanese Christian as one of the "patriotic liberals" through whom the occupation army can get help in building the new democratic Japan. Kagawa himself is announced as preparing to launch a series of radio broadcasts to preach a spiritual revival to Japan's millions. All this is immensely gratifying, especially in view of the vicious propaganda campaign some months ago to discredit this heroic leader. The chief features of this campaign were duly noted in this place, and roundly denounced. Now we know in fact what we already knew in faith—that Kagawa was the same saint that he had always been. How impressive that, with the cessation of arms, both sides should turn to this man to do what neither itself can do alone! Why did they not turn to Kagawa in the beginning, and thus avoid this horror of bloodshed and agony? Give the spiritual leaders a chance, and they will lead mankind into the ways of peace and brotherhood. But it is better late than never! In the wake of the atomic bomb, by the common judgment of Japanese and Americans alike, this man of the spirit steps forth, suddenly clothed with an authority greater than that of captains and of kings. He now can save the nation which the soldiers and politicians of Nippon did their utmost to destroy. He alone can solve difficulties, heal ills, and end war. His alone is the power to bring order out of chaos, and love out of hate. And what is now seen to be true in Japan, is true elsewhere. In India, for example! Why does not Britain turn frankly and fearlessly to Gandhi, and place in his hands the destiny of his people? "Not by power, nor by might, but by my spirit, saith the Lord!" There is the truth of ages gone—the truth by which men alone can live and therewith escape death. Japan, in her last desperate extremity, once again proves the law of God. When shall we learn? And when shall we have the divine courage to "leave all, and follow"?

Closed Eyes

The dead have silver coins placed on their eyes
To weight and keep them closed that we who live
May not be haunted by their empty gaze,
But living eyes are closed by gold which blinds
Them to the haunting want throughout the world.

LEE SPENCER.

Post-War Trade: The Blind Alley of Civilization

STANTON A. COBLENTZ

Is it possible that modern civilization has entered a *cul de sac* from which the only exit is in total war or total enslavement of the people? Has our blinded so-called progress placed us in a trap of our own making, offering us literally no choice except between "the frying pan and the fire"?

I ask these questions quite seriously, based on a consideration of certain well-known but frequently disregarded facts. And I ask them with the realization that no plan for lasting security, no world organization however desirable and however desperately needed, will in the long run solve our problem unless it provides a solution to the dilemma implied in the above questions. For we face, whether we realize it or not, an international contradiction of the most deep-rooted and fundamental nature—a contradiction with which any league or federation of nations will have the utmost difficulty in coping, though unless the problem is successfully met, no such league or federation can save us from the pit.

To speak of the economic roots of warfare — its sources in imperialism and the competition for raw materials and markets—is the merest commonplace for the present-day thinker. It is well known how the capitalistic system—the system of production for profit rather than for use—operates among the nations and within them. Since purchasing power in every country is limited by the income of the people, but productive power is limited only by the capacity of the machines, a time is likely to arrive in the history of every modern nation when industry begins to turn out more than the people can buy. This means that one of two things must happen: industry must slow down, with the result that many workers will lose their jobs and a depression will ensue, further lowering purchasing power; or some other outlet must be found for the surplus commodities. And "some other outlet," in modern parlance, means foreign trade. From the point of view of a single nation, this solution may seem theoretically simple; but from the point of view of the mass of nations, it is tremendously complicated, since foreign trade is not something that can be scooped up as abundantly as the waters of the Pacific; it is something that depends upon the purchasing power of peoples overseas, which again is not potentially unlimited, but has strict lines of demarcation. And when we consider that many nations are in danger of being thrown into competition for a trade not great enough to go around, and when furthermore we remember that there are nations such as England which are not agriculturally self-supporting and which have geared their very existence to the specialization of foreign trade, we will realize that the possibilities for conflict are innumerable. One need but reread the history of the last century and a half in order to see how conflicts actually have arisen from the erection of colonial outposts and empires, with the accompanying thrust and rivalry of military activity.

Yet there is no reason whatever to suppose that, as the world is now constituted, there will be any post-war improvement in this general situation; or that a world organization, by the mere fact of its existence, will do a great deal to eradicate the basic danger, though it might indeed do much in the highly unlikely event that the nations would submit to a thoroughgoing regulation and planned distribution of international trade. Even failing this, of course, there will be a period of reconstruction during which the world's full powers of production and transportation will be needed in order to fill in the abysmal gaps gouged out by war. But after that, what? We will not, as it happens, be forced to wait for our answer until the end of the era of reconstruction; already the signs in the wind are manifest. For example, in the *New York Times Magazine* for April 15, 1945, appears a full-page advertisement of the United States Lines, announcing "How world trade and our merchant fleet can add 10% to our post-war income." This, to be sure, is perfectly legitimate; it is only natural that, having built a huge fleet during the war, we should wish to use it after the war. Moreover, the pressure to use it will be immense as soon as our productivity has caught up with our purchasing power and we are faced with the possibilities already mentioned: a slowdown of industry, or an expansion of foreign trade.

To argue against this, as our economy is constituted, would be futile: all one can do is to point out the facts; to remind ourselves that a scramble for foreign markets is certain to develop as soon as the wastage of war has been in a measure repaired; and that out of such a scramble for markets, unless we have entirely misread history, will develop international rivalries, jealousies, and animosities that will find their outlet in military competition, which in its turn will result in war.

But is there no alternative? Yes, as a matter of fact, there is one alternative—theoretically, one alternative; and this brings us face to face with the other horn of the dilemma confronting civilization. According to our analysis, the demand for foreign trade arises in a country such as the United States when productive power outstrips purchasing power—but this is by no means the same as saying that it arises when productive power outstrips consuming power. As a matter of fact, purchasing power and consuming power are often worlds apart; under our system of private capitalism, the very persons most in need of goods are often least able to purchase them; but such potential consumers have been and always will be kept from commodities so long as production is for the sake of profits rather than of use. Were production designed to put the products of industry into the hands of those who need them rather than of those who can pay for them, the need to find a foreign market would largely disappear among most nations—at least, among nations without the extreme industrial specialization of England. And, as a consequence, one of the acknowledged root-sources of warfare would either vanish, or would diminish to the boundaries of easy control.

What, however, does this imply? Production for use and not for profit means only one thing: collectivism. It means state dominance, and the obliteration or at least the rigid restriction of private gains. It means, in a word, some form of Socialism or Communism—terms which, of course, need not in themselves cause us any alarm. But what must give us the most serious concern is the fact that collectivism, wherever it has been tried in the modern world, has resulted in dictatorship, in the suppression of those individual rights of speech and action which most of us regard as the things most worth while in our civilization. It does not

necessarily follow, to be sure, that an enlightened central authority could not confine itself to economic regulation, while leaving mankind to flower intellectually and aesthetically without restriction; but experience has no optimistic testimony to offer as to the likelihood of such a development; and one would have to close both eyes in order to disregard the known tendencies of all centralized governments to oppressive bureaucratic control if not to actual tyranny.

All of which brings us back to the question asked in the beginning: is it possible that modern civilization has entered a *cul de sac* from which the only exit is in total war or total enslavement of the people? Any attempt at a definitive answer would require a far more detailed analysis than is possible in a single article; but I do believe that no more vital and challenging question could be asked in the world today; and I am convinced that the problem is all the more challenging and the more vital since we so rarely take time to confront it at all. In any case, according to the solution that we find we will determine whether the world a generation hence will go up in smoke and flame that will mean the end of civilization as we know it; or whether we will live relatively immune to war but in chains; or whether, finally, we will bequeath to our sons an earth that is not only enduringly peaceful but free.

The New Physics and Religion

ALFRED STIERNOTTE

Because the atomic bomb focuses our attention on the energies within the atom, we are led to consider our place in life from two points of view: First, how shall we think of ourselves in relation to the fundamental building blocks of the universe, which are the intra-atomic forces? Is the old materialism of the nineteenth century completely outmoded? Do we reach a spiritual universe by using as our looking glass a radioactive atom? Is the activity of God apparent in these vortices of energy which are the electrons and protons within the atom?

And then, of course, there is the more practical question, that of the use of these energies for human welfare or human destruction. Which will it be?

Let us take up our first field of interest. How shall we think of the universe in view of the effect of the discoveries of what we call the new physics on the building blocks of the universe, the atoms? Now, it is well-known that nineteenth century science considered the atoms as hard, spherical balls, and the picture given of the whole universe was expressed in that pregnant phrase, "a fortuitous concourse of atoms." That is the phrase which was so repugnant to the religiously minded, and we can presume that theologians had fits of apoplexy over this phrase more than over any other expression of science—and quite naturally, for it implied that the aspirations of the soul, devotion to human causes, qualities of mind and heart were nothing but "a fortuitous concourse of atoms." Religious people reacted against scientists as if these were villains or demons reducing the higher aspects of the mind or soul to merely material movements or chemical reactions in the brain. Scientists, rightly or wrongly, were assumed to be pure materialists bent on destroying the higher aspects of life.

As a matter of fact, it might be difficult to find a scientist claiming that his mental and spiritual qualities were merely "a fortuitous concourse of atoms" in his brain. But at any rate, people assumed that scientists believed and taught this in their lectures. It was so easy to give rise to the old shibboleth that out of materialistic science have arisen the worse features of industrialism, with its material and money interests, its greed and injustice. People proposed a holiday for science, and Fundamentalists arrayed themselves against scientific thinking, believing it to be a mark of the very devil. This is an issue which is too large to discuss completely at this time, but one might say that scientists would be surprised to know that their opinions on chemistry and physics would have such large repercussions. And the so-called materialism of our civilization has sources much different from the work of research scientists in their laboratories.

It cannot be denied, however, that due to the discovery of uranium, and radium, and the disintegration of complex atoms into simpler atoms, the old picture of atoms as hard, round balls is utterly outmoded. The atom is mostly empty space in which there are rapidly revolving energies which are called protons, electrons, and neutrons. If an atom were magnified to the size of a church hall, the material particles which are these electrons and protons, might be merely the siz of a few pinheads. We can understand why a British wit compared the atom to the Scotchman's definition of a net, "a number of holes tied together by pieces of string."

Now the remarkable fact is that all of the ninety-two elements which are the building blocks of the universe, differ only in the arrangement and number of electrons, protons, and neutrons. The neutron is merely an electron and proton in very close union. Everything that you see is made up of electrons and protons; trees, birds, insects, animals, chairs, tables, kings and commoners, pulpits and pews and even the people who inhabit them—they are all made up of electrons and protons, and apparently the only difference is the difference in structure and arrangement. The simplest atom is the hydrogen atom, with a nucleus of one proton, and one electron revolving about it. The most complex atom is the uranium atom, with a nucleus of ninety-two protons, one hundred and forty-six neutrons, and about this nucleus revolving in very complex orbits, are ninety-two electrons. All the other ninety atoms range in complexity between the hydrogen and the uranium atom. The atom is therefore a dynamic center of energy locked up in the relationships between these extremely small particles, electrons, protons, and neutrons,—and the greatest amount of energy is packed up in the extremely minute nucleus.

Scientists, of course, wished to understand more about the "innards" of the atom, and just as a schoolboy will take his electric train apart to know what makes the wheels go round, so scientists proceeded to take the atom apart to know what makes the electrons go round. And lo and behold, in the breakup of the nucleus of the

atom tremendous amounts of energy were released, because matter changed into energy. So it appeared that matter is congealed energy. Scientists then proceeded to break up the most complex atom, uranium, because its very complexity made it unstable. It was found that a special kind of uranium, known as U-235, was easily broken down into two or more simpler elements. And here was the old dream of the alchemists—the transmutation of the elements—actually realized by science. The alchemists, as you know, had dreamed of changing lead into gold, but there is no record that they ever did so. Here is the completion of their dream in this century, but with this difference, that the uranium atom on being broken down releases two hundred million volts of energy. Furthermore, in the use of the atomic bomb, the secret of its energy is due to the fact that there are chain reactions. Chain reactions are like the writing of chain letters which superstitious people do now and then. That is to say, in order to break down the uranium atom, the nucleus must be bombarded by neutrons, and when the nucleus is shattered, more neutrons are released, and these break up more atoms. The reaction keeps going on, and you have billions and billions of atoms being smashed up, and they all add up to the tremendous shattering energy of the atomic bomb. Intense heat is also released, and since the heat of the sun is due to the same change as takes place inside the bomb, the atomic bomb has been called the sun bomb.

Now to resume our philosophy, we can readily see that the nineteenth century picture of atoms as unbreakable billiard balls is no longer in fashion because the atom has been broken to bits, and the bits appear to be particles of energy moving with the speed of light. Since matter can be changed into energy, matter seems to be a condensation of energy. These newer views have been popularized by two eminent scientists, Jeans and Eddington, whose charming books have won many converts to their philosophy. Jeans in particular, in his little book, *The Mysterious Universe,* said that the new physics gave the lie to the old materialism, for the new picture of the Cosmos seemed to be one in which one could perceive behind the intra-atomic forces the activity of the Creator, or of a "cosmic mind." In the words of Jeans: "Mind no longer appears as an accidental intruder in the realm of matter; we are beginning to suspect that we ought rather to hail it as the creator and governor of the realm of matter—not of course our individual minds, but the mind in which the atoms out of which our individual minds have grown exist as thoughts."

Jeans here implies that the atoms of the universe are really thoughts in the mind of God. He himself advances this theory very tentatively, but many enthusiastic supporters of religion hailed this controversial idea as implying the return of science to religion. The whole world of matter and energy is merely an appearance for "cosmic mind," and "cosmic mind" is held to be the only final reality. Jeans called God "a great mathematician," for he no doubt assumed that God would work out the complex mathematics of the atom with much less pain than attended the labors of earthly mathematicians! Many people were persuaded that science and religion had become reconciled, and no doubt derived great comfort from this synthesis.

I should like to add a footnote to this matter of spiritual comfort. Suppose you meet a woman whose son has been killed in this war. Suppose you would comfort this woman by telling her: "Now, madam, don't worry, God is a great mathematician." Do you think that that mechanical picture of God would be at all reassuring?

One must admit that the great majority of scientists do not agree with this apparent reconciliation of science and religion. The fact that the atoms are bundles of energy, and no longer material in the old sense, does not mean that they are immaterial and therefore mental or spiritual. If you say that matter is that which exists objectively and independently of mind, then the bundles of energy in the atom are still material. There is no reason why the energy of the atom should be energy spelled with capital E. You do not make a god of energy by spelling it with a capital E. And if we say that the atom is a thought of God, then the violent explosion over Hiroshima was due to an explosive thought of God. If we think of God too closely in terms of intra-atomic energy, then we make him responsible for the destruction of Hiroshima.

This is the crux of the matter in the question of the philosophy of the new physics. The atomic bomb has thrown the theories of Jeans and Eddington into high relief. If we connect "cosmic mind," or God, too closely with the twists in the ether, which are electrons and protons, then we are making "cosmic mind" responsible for the atomic bomb explosion. It would rather appear that the atoms in the atomic bomb are not the thoughts of God, but the thoughts of the very devil. This is the impasse into which we are led. And what is the way out?

The way out is simply this, that we should not be too sure of identifying the activity of God with the waves of the ether or intra-atomic forces. One of our hymns gives us a new approach to this problem:

> Go not my soul, in search of him,
> Thou wilt not find him there,—
> Or in the depths of shadow dim,
> Or heights of upper air.
>
> For not in far-off realms of space
> The spirit hath its throne;
> In every heart it findeth place
> And waiteth to be known.

In other words, if we are looking for signs of God's creative activity, we must look for these in the mind of man, and not so much in the energies of the atom. The picture of the universe given by emergent evolution is that of many levels, the lowest level being the atom and its energies. Then you rise to the levels of complex molecules, then to the level of one-celled organisms, then to the many forms of plant life and animal life, and finally at the very top of the whole evolutionary pyramid, to the mind and spirit of man. The whole picture is that of a dynamic process in which mental and spiritual qualities emerge in the higher stages, and at the human level we find the emergence of qualities of mind and heart, strivings for truth, goodness, and beauty.

That is why the highest assertion ever made about human nature is this: "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the spirit of God dwelleth in you?" In other words, man, the spirit of man, is the temple of God. The spirit of God does not dwell primarily in the energies of the atom, but the spirit of God dwelleth in you! In man's creative energies, whether they be manifested in scientific discovery, or

in the arts, or in literature, or in the drama, or in ethical and social movements—in all these things the creative spirit of God is emerging in a common quest for the good life for everyone, regardless of creed, race, or color.

The energy of the atom is purely mechanical energy which may be destructive or constructive according as men will it to be so. There is no need to say that scientists are concocting devilish instruments in their laboratories. Scientists do what they are told to do, and they are told to carry on specific research by government or industrial laboratories. Scientists are eager that new sources of power shall be used for human welfare. J. D. Bernal, in a recent article in *The Nation,* "Everybody's Atom," makes a plea for this very purpose. The decision, however, does not depend on scientists alone. It depends ultimately on the government and on industrial interests; and in so far as these reflect the will of the people for human welfare, will the work of scientists also be used for human welfare. The decision depends ultimately upon the people who must demand that these tremendous energies and new sources of power be used not for selfish interests but for the public good. And in that demand we shall have the cooperation of scientists.

We are entering a new power age. How soon these new energies will be controlled and replace our steam and hydro power we cannot say. But with increasing control of the powers of the universe, there must be an increasing control of the powers of the human mind for cooperation and not competition. The ethical life of man must keep pace with industrial possibilities. Man being potentially the temple of God, he will either rise to control natural forces for his own good, or else he will pass away. And the destructive possibility of this new atomic power will perhaps be the incentive with which man will achieve its mastery.

Abolishing Hate

GEORGE LAWRENCE PARKER

It is just possible that hate is a stronger word than hatred. I choose it here because I meet everyday things for which I have hatred but cannot and do not hate.

For instance, on my small farm I have to contend with woodchucks and rabbits who spoil my garden. As devastators of my crops I can do nothing but bear toward them a vital animosity. To my distress I am obliged to war against them. But to hate them is quite impossible. Taking them for what they are, I even have a rather definite affection for them.

This competition between them and me is not of my making, and probably not of theirs. But the war between us is inevitable. Yet even so, no hate enters into it. Their right to live, on the animal scale, is as valid as mine. When competitive sharing becomes impossible one sharer must become a cooperating partner, or cease to survive. Human society cannot freely share its food and living-space with woodchucks, lions, mice, or the Colorado beetle. We exercise the right of murder upon them, but without the element of hate.

When we come to the matter of human warfare, our picture suffers a change; it just does not seem to hang together as I have briefly set it forth. The colors are both too strong and too weak. And we must not be surprised at this, for the fact is that within the human circle a vast new law or ingredient enters into consideration, explain it how we will. That high new element is affection, sympathy, love. Whatever name we give it, it is something that we cannot bestow with the same significance on animals. Within the human orbit the question is no longer who has the right to live, but the deep-seated consciousness that every human being has that right. Each soul of man is on earth by no prior wish of its own; that is our fundamental charter of liberty; and that fact alone makes murder and war an interference with the universe itself. Whoever exercises hate to the extent of war or murder is breaking the law by which he himself lives. All murder is self-murder.

It is becoming clearer and clearer that all nations are losers in war, almost equal losers. Formerly in history this was not as plain as it is now. Today the totality of humanity has stepped out on the stage as a living entity. The common conception of victory for any one part of it is fading out. The denial of the right to live is no longer a local denial but universal, cursing "him who gives as well as him who takes."

Our exercise of this denial is our historic habit, not yet outgrown. Hate has seemed to be the final and normal expression of each nation's own right to live, supreme above the rights of other nations. The most likely people to make this claim are those who were allies in their former hate against a common enemy. The flame leaps over previous ties like a forest fire, destroying the earlier friendship. This process of going around in a vain circle of companionship and hate, of admiration and condemnation, of compliment and vituperation, of blessing and cursing, of appreciation and vilification is beyond all the rules of sanity. Nothing is left to say except that, for the time being, the human mind has ceased to be a mind. If we deny today what we said yesterday, under similar conditions, the cord of intelligence and reason has snapped in the middle. Mental responsibility has surrendered.

Plainly, then, the abolition of hate must begin with a new mind-set endowed with a hitherto unheard of generosity in our make-up. The right to live demands a new proclamation. This does not mean that interference and temporary interruptions can at once be abolished among nations. It does mean that such interferences shall be settled on the human scale and not on the level of brute force and animality. If we but used the full reserve power of religion, education, science, understanding, sympathy, and sacrifice as we now use them in war, the path of mankind would not be cluttered with the wreckage and delays that hate has obtruded against us.

If this is said to be just the one impossible thing, two replies are at hand. First, the impossibility of it has never yet been proved. Second, unless this possibility begins to be acted out in practice, mankind is doomed to suicide.

The queston, then, is simply this: Is the abolition of hate possible? Our modern wars are really civil wars. At this moment the hot flames burn in family dissension

in almost every nation. Against these home fires no international charter of peace can prevail. Nothing can meet the situation but the casting out of the demon of hate from the substrata of the human heart. Until the hearts of all men everywhere begin to be changed, the world cannot be changed. This is a long road, one not for Utopian dreaming! Nevertheless, to begin to travel it is the nearest and next step on man's agenda. The idealism of this about-face has too long been sneered at. Love as a working force has been too long the target for derision. To the deriders, this challenge must be thrown, for it is overdue: "If, in the light of hate's failure, you have a more practical word than love, in God's name speak it out! If not, then leave the tottering stage of mankind's drama to those who have the courage to use the forbidden word of love."

The right to live can only be balanced by the right to love. If man is ever to make a real success story of his existence he must begin it with this new word, for our former key word of hate has proved to be a monumental failure.

When I ask myself who and what I would have been had I been born in Germany or Japan, there is but one reply. I would have been a German or a Japanese; a simple fact forgotten by most people. The blessed Americanism for which I am grateful cannot pose as my own choice, nor scarcely as the choice of my ancestors; history put that whole matter beyond their or my control. This does not compel me to glaze over the sins of Germany and Japan. I cannot substitute their barbarism for my civilization, nor their religion for mine. But I can see, or think I see, that to literally hate them is beyond and below my heritage, my sanity, and my faith. If I was born in Kentucky and have lived most of my life in Massachusetts I am not therefore given full permit to hate a man who was born in Massachusetts and lived most of his life in Kentucky. To inject the possibility of hate into the results of a moving van or a railroad ticket just does not make sense. The very fact that our enemies chanced to be born in their (misguided!) countries relieves me, almost robs me, of the luxury of hating them.

I here indulge in no sentimentality nor verge toward the soft and slippery road of a forgiving forgetfulness. Much could and should be said concerning forgiveness and anti-forgiveness; but we must by-pass it now. However, the cold logic of "love your enemies" seems to me to be as unswervingly correct as mathematics. It is a law as hard as steel. It is forged in the fires of man's unsatisfied soul. It is a weapon that we can neither bend nor break. It is a resistless force, as different from empty idealism as hard steel is from spongy iron. If St. Paul is right when he says that "knowledge [science] shall vanish away but love abideth," we are led to the conclusion that this thing called love is a laboratory matter, a science to whose unfolding there is no limit. To undertake its development now, as a science, seems obligatory; our next step in education.

Hate must be progressively and continuously abolished because it breaks the central law of the universe, if there be any law at the center of the universe. Hate is a lawless gangster—have we not seen it proved such? Against it we have only one chieftain. All others have failed us. That chieftain's name is Love, or the same thing by any other name. He is not a lawbreaker but "the fulfilling of the law." A world overburdened with law might well call him in as the only possible leader. We are repeating on all sides today our desire for a world of law, decency, and order. To chart them in blueprints ranging from The Atlantic Charter to The San Francisco Charter is undoubtedly a necessary procedure, and very good kindergarten practice. But a "more excellent way," that is a more efficient way, is the way of love. Love alone possesses maturity, experience, and power.

This is the hardest way. Why not grant that? It will require all we have to give. How familiar that sounds! War's costs and mobilizations are but child's play in comparison.

But no other way is open to us.

The Child's Morality

ETHEL S. BEER

Children are often unmoral. They are born with no sense of right and wrong. Their egotism is a form of self-preservation which, likely as not, results in unmoral conduct. Because this is an unconscious reaction, not deliberate, we speak of it as unmoral instead of immoral. For in the beginning, the so-called wickedness of the child carries no feeling of shame. Children do not recognize the difference between what they should and should not do. This is taught them by adults. The significance of good and bad is learned from the grown-ups in charge. But children do not accept this teaching just as it is given. They may accept the morality imposed on them but they build up their own interpretation.

For instance, children do not recognize varying shades of right and wrong behavior. They judge by what is on the surface and make no allowance for the determining undercurrents. The subtle behavior of adults is quite beyond their comprehension. A lie is a lie to them, no matter what the reason is for telling it. We often hear of the little boy who remonstrates with his mother because she treats people with what she calls diplomacy. For instance, she instructs the maid to tell visitors that she is out when all the time she is sitting upstairs. Such conduct is beyond the youngster's comprehension. Her explanation that she is not at home to company and that this is the polite way to say so when she does not want to see them, cuts no ice with Son who cannot fathom such a situation. If he does not want to see anybody, he says so outright. Unfortunately Mother cannot afford such frankness.

This inconsistency in adult behavior puzzles many children. It is silly for a mother to din into her children's ears the necessity of telling the truth when she herself openly fibs in front of them. If she can do this, why cannot they? Some children figure these things out to their own satisfaction. For example, a young woman told me how as a little girl she used to watch her teacher's table manners. She said:

> At first I could not grasp why teacher could put her elbows on the table during meals while if I did it I was reprimanded. Finally I came to the conclusion that I, too, would have the privilige when I was bigger. So

my ambition became to grow up in order to be allowed to put my elbows on the table.

Children's minds often work this way on big issues as well as in such trivial matters. They cannot understand why it is right to do something at one minute and wrong at another. If it is wrong to hit anybody, why should Daddy spank them? Is that not illogical? Or again, yesterday was Tom's birthday. He was allowed to eat a piece of cake. Why, then, should he not help himself to a slice today when he finds the cake in the kitchen? The accusation that this is stealing because he did not ask permission can hardly be comprehended because the day before he was told that this cake had been given him for his birthday. Besides, in the beginning, everything belongs to the child presumably. That is, in its own estimation. Therefore, to take something without asking is its due and not an act of misbehavior.

The trouble is that in not recognizing shades children do not draw the same distinction as adults. For this reason they often misjudge grown-up people's actions. This applies not only to their treatment of them but to their own social relations. Children can worry themselves sick over entirely unfounded gossip. They do not analyze the foundation of rumors but take them at surface value. Particularly is this true if they hear the slightest aspersion cast upon their own parents or somebody else near and dear to them. This grief is extreme and cannot be laughed at. A child really suffers about these sins of others, real or imaginary, which it cannot remedy nor render intelligible to itself. For on the one hand, children are not interested in the things which they do not understand and on the other, hearing about them, stimulates their curiosity. Both situations may cause the child's misbehavior, although they seem to be just the opposite. How does this work out?

Often we notice that children are what we term naughty whenever there are guests. They can stand being a part of the audience just so long and then they must break out. Adults are inclined to punish the children when frequently it is their own fault. The grown-ups have been talking amongst themselves, quite forgetting the presence of the youngsters. Their conversation has been about subjects which interest them but which are above the heads of the youthful members. No provision has been made for the amusement of these latter. They are told to sit still and listen. Is it a wonder, then, that after awhile the children become impatient and start mischief? To their minds they are not doing anything wrong; they are just trying to amuse themselves. Why should they accept boredom without resistance? Besides, they are being ignored; therefore, they will do almost anything to get attention. The drives here are a wish to escape monotony and a craving to be in the limelight. Both are illustrative of the selfishness of the child but not of its desire to be naughty.

It is a little more difficult to show how puzzling over incomprehensible incidents also leads to misbehavior. But it is recognized that bad conduct in a child is often a symbol of a feeling of neglect. That is, no explanation is given for unavoidable circumstances which arise and change a child's existence. These may be directly connected with the child itself or some change in the environment. For instance, if a child is deceived it feels cheated and may react in a revengeful spirit. Whether this will cause active wrongdoing like stealing or moody introspection is determined by the individual child. Adults are too prone to expect children to take things for granted. They rarely warn them of even the impending events which they themselves anticipate. For example, a new baby is expected in the family. Yet the older brother is not told. Suddenly he realizes that another being has appeared to monopolize his mother's attention. He does not understand why mother should be shared when heretofore she was almost entirely at his beck and call. So the naughtiness that ensues is brought on by the misunderstanding of a situation. He is trying to win back something lost rather than to do something wicked.

The birth of the child's sense of morality comes after adult criticism, and punishment has made it realize its own wrongdoing which it continues wilfully. Knowing that there are definite rules of conduct, the child nevertheless ignores them deliberately. The reasons for this bad behavior may not differ materially from those already described. But the child is guilt conscious. This changes the significance of the behavior.

But when children start to have standards they do not entirely conform to those taught by adults. They set up their own patterns, partly influenced by the instruction of the grown-ups and partly made up through their own interpretation. The groups do not always agree in the principles upheld; some advocate one line of conduct while others prefer another. There are so many stimuli which enter into a child's life and affect its character. These cannot be controlled completely no matter how careful is the upbringing. But most children are fairly uniform in a certain type of judgment.

They are severe critics of themselves. There are specific rules to which they adhere almost universally. Generally speaking, all children will condemn an appeal to grown-ups to settle a quarrel. This, they consider tattle-telling and such behavior is disloyal. It is amusing to watch how excited a bunch of youngsters will get if one deserts the playground to go tell mother. Such an incident is of momentous importance to the rest, and woe betide the tale-bearer. He or she is not easily forgiven.

No less unpopular is the girl or boy who lies himself or herself out of trouble. This, to the rest, is absolute meanness. Besides, it denotes a lack of courage for which the malefactor is detested. So often there is a child who dares not face the music, although it has been an active participator in the mischief. This is courting the anger of the group which as likely as not will result in ostracism. The children do not analyze that behind this miscreant there may be a background which fosters such cowardice. To them it is simply a deviation from their own mores. This is reprehensible.

In speaking of children's criticism of one another, it must be remembered that quite logically they emphasize non-conformity to their own regulations. This is why so often the goody-goody is detested. The child who will not join in antics is considered a poor sport. This is inexcusable. Therefore, he or she is hated, and excluded from the charmed circle. This is a terrible punishment for a child who hates to go against its own conscience yet does not want to be left out because he is a kill-joy. Probably this explains how the gang spirit gains influence over many youngsters who show remarkable possibilities yet land in the path of evil. They are torn between two streams: one, the realization of those morals taught by adults and the other the standards of their own associates. No wonder they often yield

to temptation rather than desert their comrades! Nobody enjoys being exiled.

But if children are harsh on themselves they are even harsher on grown-ups. They cannot abide compromises. The social customs which make for pleasant intercourse in adult life are incomprehensible to children. Their righteousness is boldly outlined; they have no use for subterfuges. Such concepts as that the means justify the end do not click in a child's mentality. The child cannot realize how good can imperceptibly shade into evil. These different outlooks cause much misery because adults often fail to consider the child's point of view. Quite possibly they have no key to the attitudes of childhood, having forgotten their own and never studied those of children. Therefore, they are impatient with the girl or boy who demands less confusion and more clearly defined principles of morality.

Children expect to be treated absolutely honestly. The mother who slinks away because she is afraid that her baby will make a scene about her going, challenges disaster. Not often will a child forgive lies told or acted. These to him savor of deliberate deception, no matter what the excuse given. Besides, following its own reasoning, if mother evades an unpleasant issue, why should the child not do so also? The doctor who says that he will hurt when he has to, is far more respected by the child than the one who tells falsehoods. The child gives frankness and expects it from others in return. That is the way it applies morality.

It is only very gradually that children discover that the art of compromise is necessary to fit into present-day society. This is the development of social morality in contradistinction to the mores established in children's groups. How it comes about is to a certain extent inexplicable. The mental process may be chiefly imitation shaped by the herd impulse. It is the desire of an individual not yet mature to behave correctly in a world modeled for and by adults. The molding of children's characters is the foundation for a social or non-social human being. There are many theories as to the why and wherefore that provide these influences in childhood. What makes one child react to certain stimuli while another is not affected by them, is as difficult to fathom as why this person gets a certain disease when exposed and another avoids it. These are the puzzles of humanity before which even science stands aghast.

All that we can state is that when a child's behavior becomes deliberately bad it can be called immoral. Before that it is only unmoral. The continuation of misconduct knowingly shows that the child has had contact with adult morality, whether or not it wishes to abide by the rules. This difference is a distinction which a child may not draw consciously and a grown-up may not even recognize. It is this groping of adults for a common meeting ground which must bear analysis. Otherwise, it is foolish to expect children to adapt themselves to the standards of society. If the world will understand the deviation of children's morality from that of adults', we may succeed in working out some rules whereby we can change character. But this can only be done if we adopt clear-cut premises in our own morality, not the inconsistencies existent to date. Children have their own contribution to make. This is their honesty, for their morality is always frank if sometimes ruthless. This frankness, to my mind, is of tremendous importance in all morality and therefore should not be criticized but encouraged.

The Study Table

Dark Night

THE DARK NIGHT OF THE SOUL. *By Georgia Harkness. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press. 192 pp. $1.50.*

Several years ago I listened to a sermon by Georgia Harkness which impressed me profoundly as being full of good sense, realistic insights, and helpful suggestions. I made notes of her points—one, two, three—and carried them around in my purse in the belief that some day they might be needed by someone in that state of spiritual depression where living seems futile and God remote and uncaring.

Apparently numerous other people found one of her articles which appeared in the *Christian Century* in 1942 ("If I Make My Bed in Hell") equally thought-provoking and helpful, for Miss Harkness tells us that after its publication she received ten times the usual number of appreciative letters from her reading audience. That response prompted the writing of this book. The article is reprinted as its first chapter, while the sermon, as nearly as I can tell, composes the final chapter entitled "Joy for Mourning."

In these and the eight intervening chapters we learn a great deal about nervous depression in its various forms, its causes, and its cures. We find (and this constituted for me some of the most interesting material) from their own writings that many great souls from both the past and the present suffered periodic experiences in which they seemed cut off from God and from His help even though they were pathetically eager for divine companionship, and observed—as they thought—the same pattern of behavior which at other times spelled security and a warm sense of God's presence. This experience was labeled by a sixteenth century mystic, St. John of the Cross, "The Dark Night of the Soul." Miss Harkness borrows this beautiful phrase for the title of her book.

She defines her subject in this way:

". . . an experience which is not that of a remote time or place, or special degree of saintliness, but which besets the path of the earnest Christian in every age."

". . . the sense of spiritual desolation, loneliness, frustration, and despair which grips the soul of one who, having seen the vision of God and been lifted by it, finds the vision fade and the presence of God recede."

The author explains that common as this experience is among sensitive people, "when we examine the modern literature of religious therapy and psychology of religion, one finds a surprising vacuum" regarding it. Her book is an initial effort to muster into one short, readable volume for laymen and ministers alike, the findings of psychiatry, the testimonies of some of the great mystics of the past and "common folk" of the present who have triumphed over depression, some common sense suggestions growing out of her own study of the problem, and the theological bases which undergird both the experience and its cure.

Each phase of her development struck me as ex-

tremely stimulating, and I write as a layman both in the field of psychology and theology. I would guess, however, that many lay readers might skip pretty hastily over those chapters dealing with theological implications, though it could prove rewarding to become acquainted with Miss Harkness' modern interpretation of theological phrases which have been discredited in much of our thinking because their original connotations seem today to be unintelligible or inadequate. I refer to "sin," "the will of God," "perfectionism," "purgation," "forgiveness," and "grace." To breathe new life into these concepts and to translate them into the language of our day is surely a significant accomplishment.

Miss Harkness believes, you see, that the experience of the Dark Night is both a sin and a disease (sin having been defined as willed actions, or acquiescence in attitudes contrary to the highest cooperation with the will of God). To treat the experience as an either/or phenomenon can be the error of the misguided cleryman or secularized psychologist. It is an insistence that the sufferer's condition needs to be diagnosed and treated from the psychological, medical, social, and religious angles which characterizes Miss Harkness' constructive approach.

Among other recommendations she affirms her belief that the services of a psychiatrist should be as easily available as the services of the church. She would, in the meantime, e n d o w her pastoral counselors with greater insight and knowledge of practical psychology than many bring to the profession today.

Now the points by which a person in a state of nervous depression may hope to find relief are these: "(1) willingness to be helped; (2) the correction of any physical causes or environmental factors that can be ascertained and changed; (3) the acceptance as inevitable of those factors that cannot be changed; (4) an object of devotion and interest outside oneself; (5) the gaining of perspective, and (6) confidence that life has meaning."

An elaboration and, in some cases, a recapitulation of these points which are discussed earlier in the book in less cryptic form, composes the final chapter of the volume—that chapter drawn from the sermon which I found so straightforwardly helpful. Here is effective advice not only for those who have known or may know the Dark Night experience, but hope also for those larger numbers of people who must certainly be familiar with occasional "twilight" periods in their religious or emotional lives. Who indeed but the stolidly insensitive is not?

ELEANOR DARNALL WALLACE.

The Christian Year

THE STORY OF THE CHRISTIAN YEAR. *By George M. Gibson. New York: Abingdon-Cokesbury Press. 238 pp. $2.50.*

In *The Story of the Christian Year* we observe the forces at work which created the many days and seasons around which the religious year spins.

George M. Gibson is to be highly commended for his completely objective, sympathetic approach to the growth of customs and traditions within the lifestream of Christianity, regardless of the manner in which they were molded. Here is a volume which fills in many chinks left open in the average clergyman's theological school education.

On the face of it, a study of the origin and meaning of the multiple parts of the Christian year might seem to be a time-wasting concession to certain less desirable types of religious formalism. On the contrary, this rewarding exposition reinforces and clarifies the liberal, and particularly the Unitarian, conception of the memorable events in Christian church history. The hand of man, the impulse of superstition, the influence of prejudice and expediency, are seen intruding upon and creating events and ritual which orthodoxy and Fundamentalism have since chosen to label divine.

There is a great deal of excellent material for expository sermons contained in this book. The plea for planning carefully the full year's pulpit schedule needs to be heeded. The use, however, of the Christian year as a basis does not provide, in this writer's opinion, the strongest backbone for such a project. Too often the result is a stretching and warping of subject matter in order to effect an undesirable fit. Some basis of planning is, however, better than none.

With a noticeable lack of padding, Dr. Gibson has provided us with a clear, well-arranged and impartial discussion of the Christian year as it has developed from the pagan practices of the pre-Christian era down to modern times.

JOHN NICHOLLS BOOTH.

Rainer Maria Rilke

LETTERS OF RAINER MARIA RILKE, *1892-1910. Translated by Jane Bannard Greene and M. D. Herter Norton. New York: W. W. Norton and Company. 400 pp.*

Letters and diaries are always interesting, if not always great literature; but Rilke's letters are both interesting and great literature. These letters make also the spiritual autobiography of a great poet. The molding of his personality through his relationship with the famous sculptor, Rodin, the influence of his sculptress wife, Clara Westhoff, his love for Russia, his discovery of Cézanne, all appear in these early letters. In spite of these various contacts, his letters cry out constantly for solitude, the necessary environment for his soul and for the inspiration which came upon him as prophecy came over Saul. Letter writing urged inspiration upon him.

It is good for Americans to study Rilke, the typical continental cosmopolitan poet. He brings back a lost Europe, for the Europe of Henry James and Balzac and even Rilke is forever gone, and the soul of mankind is therefore forever impoverished. Rilke combines all that past glory in his Czech birth, his German education, his secretaryship to the great Rodin in Paris, his love for Italy, his passion for Russia, his acquaintance with Tolstoy, his understanding of Sweden and all Scandinavia.

In these days when sinister influences try to arouse enmity with Russia, it is good to catch Rilke's enthusiasm for that great people. His words are pregnant with meaning: ". . . perhaps the Russian was made to let the history of mankind pass by in order later to chime into the harmony of things with his singing heart." Likewise his insight into the French, Italian, and Scandinavian is equally trenchant. We need in these days to catch this and to meditate upon it.

Rilke began his poetry early in life. Even during his student days at the University of Berlin, he began to publish. His first book appeared in his twentieth year, and this was followed in rapid succession by a large number of important volumes in both German and French. Only a small amount of his work has been translated into English; hence the great importance of his letters. Let us hope the translators will immediately issue a second volume of his letters bringing the story of his life to its untimely end. The translation is well-nigh faultless, and several pages of well-selected notes add to the book's value. Everyone in any way interested in modern European literature should ponder well this book.

C. A. Hawley.

Accepting Life

Life, I Salute You. *By Boris Kader. Cambridge, Mass.: Sci-Art. 365 pp. $3.00.*

The introduction to this interesting book was written by Reinhold Niebuhr. The book is largely biographical and as Dr. Niebuhr says: "He insists upon accepting life with gratitude, despite the trials through which he has lived."

Dr. Kader was born in Russia, studied law at the old University of St. Petersburg, and later was a student in Germany. After five years under Hitler, he escaped from Germany and came to the United States.

Dr. Kader has special interest in the problem of suicide. The disturbed condition of the world during the past generation has increased the temptation to suicide. He presents much evidence to prove that there are resources, particularly religious resources, which make it possible for people to overcome this temptation.

After all he and his people have suffered, it renews one's faith in human greatness to read, "My intimate knowledge of other peoples among whom I have lived, has taught and convinced me that there are no vicious nations nor virtuous nations. There are people—good and bad." That is a sample of the man, a scholar and a truly civilized human being.

James M. Yard.

A Sacred Anthology

The Eleven Religions. *A Comparative Study by Selwyn Gurney Champion, M.D. New York: E. P. Dutton & Company. $3.75.*

This is a curious book. It is in form an anthology of quotations from the scriptures of the eleven great religions of the world. These religions, each one introduced by a scholarly essay, are Buddhism, Christianity, Confucianism, Hebraism, Hinduism, Islam, Jainism, Shinto, Sikhism, Taoism and Zoroastrianism. A general introduction to the whole is offered by Dr. Rufus M. Jones.

The scriptural material presented in this volume is all of a proverbial nature. Few quotations run to more than eight or ten lines, while the majority are two or three. The proverbs or sayings, in the case of each religion, are arranged alphabetically according to the central word or thought in the particular passage. This makes easily possible a cross-reference which shows how strikingly similar are the teachings of the great religions of the world. This book is indeed a demonstration of the truth of the Bahai saying, "Ye are all the fruit of one tree, and the leaves of one branch." The Golden Rule, here presented in ten different versions, is of course the supreme illustration of this basic spiritual fact.

A work of this kind has its uses. It is impressive just as a witness of the one religion that underlies the many religions of mankind. But I personally am always troubled by these brief, fragmentary selections from great scriptures. Proverbs are illuminating, but they tend to move on the surface of things. It is the long sustained passages that carry us into the depths of wisdom and enlightenment—and these passages are here either broken up or do not appear at all. The pages devoted in this anthology to Christianity are a pitiful substitute for the Gospels and the Epistles, and the same must be true of the other religions cited.

But we must take the book for what it is. Within its self-imposed limits it is an admirable piece of work, representing prodigious labor, ample scholarship, and sound judgment. The only lapse we have detected is an extraordinarily inaccurate version of Herbert Carruth's famous poem, "A Firemist and a Planet." This mutilation of a noble poem should be corrected in future reprints or new editions.

John Haynes Holmes.

Little Houses of the Mind

Move out of your little houses, men and women; they are doomed.
Move out!
Before they smother you, before they are blown to bits and you with them.
They are going the way of slums blasted to splinters,
Never to be rebuilt.
Your little houses are going the way of sea-walls and land-walls
Built to shut out the world—
Your little houses where there is no room but for your own gods,
Where the doors are too small for other peoples
And the atmosphere stifles strange thoughts—
Your little houses where you sit and dream of your own superiority,
And imagine you are safe,
While the whir of their destruction is already in the air.
The time has come for high houses and great houses,
With roofs open to the sky
And doors facing all lands
And an understanding of all gods.
If you stay in your little houses,
The storm that is coming will crush you;
You will be buried in their ashes
And you will cry out against the fate which came to you
All because you would not move—
Would not move out of your little houses.
Move out, men and women; there are great houses now,
Where the soul expands as your contacts have spread,
Where the mind grows as your communication has grown;
Where there is room, room, and the world comes in,
Every guest bringing his gift of appreciation.
Move out, now while there is time, out of your little houses!

Sheldon Shepard.

Western Conference News

RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois

MINISTERS APPROVE APPEAL

Thirty Unitarian ministers from the Western Unitarian Conference, meeting in two institutes in Evanston, Illinois, and in Omaha, Nebraska, unanimously passed resolutions in support of the United Unitarian Appeal. The resolution read: "We urge our churches and the other churches of our fellowship to give increased support to the United Unitarian Appeal in order to forward the Unitarian Advance program on both the national and the local bases."

The churches of the Conference have increased their total contribution and the percentage of their combined quota each year. It is to be hoped that this precedent will be followed again this year. Each church should be putting in extra effort this year to raise the quota assigned to it. Experience, facts, and figures amply demonstrate that those churches which do the best in raising the United Unitarian Appeal also do the best in raising their own budgets. Interest in the larger work also pays dividends on the local scene.

LAKE GENEVA CONFERENCE

Raymond B. Bragg and Mrs. Sophia Fahs are among those who have already accepted invitations to be on the faculty at Lake Geneva next summer. The Conference will be held August 11 to 18 at College Camp.

Mr. Bragg will give the general lectures on the Conference Theme—"Religion for One World." Mrs. Fahs will give two courses: one on "The Psychological Foundations of Building a Free Faith," and one on "Junior High School Methods and Materials" based on her book *Jesus, The Carpenter's Son.*

Further information on the Geneva Conference will be out soon.

If your church has not already done so, you should begin now building a scholarship fund for Geneva. It will result in improvement and increased efficiency in your church and church school program next year.

"FOOD—NOT—COFFINS"

The nation-wide program of Unitarians for sending food to Europe has taken hold in many of our churches. Many churches made Thanksgiving or Christmas Sundays, or both, days when members of the congregation brought canned goods to church for the Unitarian Service Committee. Some of our ministers informed their friends that instead of giving presents this last Christmas they were giving the money that would have been so spent to the Food Fund.

Unique is the campaign for food conducted by the St. Louis church. Nation-wide publicity was given to the "Cans for Congress" campaign it conducted last October. This was done to bring forcibly to the attention of Congress the need for passing the appropriation for UNRRA. During December the First Unitarian Church of St. Louis was the sponsor of the UNRRA canned food campaign for the city of St. Louis.

M.T.S. CONFERENCE

The Sixth Meadville Conference was held at the Meadville Theological School on December 27 and 28. Alumni, former students, and some guests were invited to participate in the lectures and discussions led by members of the faculty of the University of Chicago.

This holiday session at Meadville revived a custom that had been interrupted by the war.

RICHARD KUCH

Rev. G. Richard Kuch, who for the past two and a half years has been minister of the Church of the Christian Union (Unitarian) of Rockford, Illinois, began his new activities as Associate Director of the American Unitarian Youth on January 1. The office of the A.U.Y. is at 25 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass.

DAYTON

The Dayton *Daily News* came out editorially for the appointment of Rev. Harold Marley to the School Board. The paper considers him the most qualified person for the position. In the last school election Mr. Marley polled more than 16,000 votes, failing of election by less than 400 votes.

LOUISVILLE

Rev. William Safford Jones, D.D., is now the interim minister of the First Unitarian Church of Louisville, Kentucky. Dr. Jones recently retired as minister of the Unitarian Church of Portsmouth, New Hampshire.

LON RAY CALL

Rev. Lon Ray Call, Minister-at-Large for the American Unitarian Association, and former Secretary of the Western Unitarian Conference, was married on December 27 to Mrs. Lucy Powers of Spokane, Washington. Mrs. Powers returned to the United States recently from overseas work with the American Red Cross. Mr. Call, who just completed organizing a new Unitarian church in San Antonio, Texas, is now in New England. Mr. and Mrs. Call can be addressed through 25 Beacon Street, Boston, Massachusetts.

OFF THE PRESS

Word has been received that the book, *The Meaning of Humanism,* by Dr. Curtis W. Reese, will be off the press in January. Dr. Reese is Dean of The Abraham Lincoln Centre, Chicago, and is President of the Western Unitarian Conference. The book is being published by the Beacon Press, Boston. Copies can be purchased through the Western Conference Office at $1.00 per volume.

JOURNAL OF LIBERAL RELIGION

The fall issue of the *Journal of Liberal Religion,* edited by Edwin T. Buehrer, contained an article on the *Reader's Digest* by Helen Rand Miller. Mrs. Miller was chairman of the Committee on Newspapers and Magazines of the National Council of Teachers of English. The article has been widely quoted.

The *Journal of Liberal Religion* is sponsored by the Unitarian Ministerial Union and the Meadville Theological School and is well worth reading. It is published quarterly, the subscription rate is one dollar, and it can be secured through Rev. Edwin T. Buehrer, 301 North Mayfield Avenue, Chicago 44, Illinois.

SUPPORT THE UNITED UNITARIAN APPEAL